UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,625	11/21/2003	Charles R. Barmore	D-43664-01	3475
28236 CRYOVAC, IN	7590 01/24/2007 NC.		EXAMINER	
SEALED AIR			MIGGINS, MICHAEL C	
P.O. BOX 464 DUNCAN, SC	29334		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1772	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			\
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,625	BARMORE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael C. Miggins	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the mail of the period for reply will, by state that the mail of the period for reply will, by state that the mail of the period for reply will, by state that the mail of the period for reply will, by state that the mail of the period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than three months after the mail of the period for reply will be stated by the office later than the province of the period for the period for the period for the province by the period for the period for the period for the per	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTE tute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	October 2006.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matte	s, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 31</u> is/are pending in the a	application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-2, 4 and 31</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to b	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	unto hovo hoon received		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume2. Certified copies of the priority docume		olication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr			
application from the International Bure	•	Socied in and Material Glago	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	eceived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mmary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Mail Date brmal Patent Application .	

Application/Control Number: 10/719,625 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/27/06 has been entered.

REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

2. All of the 103 rejections set forth or maintained in the final rejection of 5/26/06, pages 2-3, paragraphs 2-4 have been withdrawn.

REJECTIONS REPEATED

3. There are no rejections repeated.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Speer et al. (US 5529833) in view of Putnam et al. (US 6794191) and Inoue et al. (US 5358876).

Speer discloses a rigid container (column 3, lines 64-67) comprising an oxygen barrier having an oxygen transmission rate of no more than 100 cc/m²/24hr at 25 degrees C, 0% RH, 1 atm (column 7, lines 12-28, column 9, lines 46-62), an oxygen scavenger, all in various configurations (column 11, lines 4-25, column 12, lines 12-32).

The difference between the instant claims and Speer is that Speer does not disclose an oxygen indicator comprising a luminescent compound.

Putnam discloses an oxygen indicator in a polymer film (column 2, lines 54-67) laminated on a barrier film (column 3, lines 55-61), wherein the oxygen indicator has a luminescent compound (column 5, lines 10-20) for use in food packaging as an inner or outer layer (column 6, lines 1-15) for the purpose of accurately detecting oxygen in packaging (applies to instant claims 1-2 and 4). Putnam also discloses wherein the oxygen indicator is substantially shielded by oxygen barrier layers from oxygen in the environment surrounding the container, and from oxygen in any headspace within the container" which is disclosed in Putnam (column 11, line 17 through column 12, line12).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to have provided an oxygen indicator comprising a luminescent compound in the container of Speer in order to provide detection of oxygen in the packaging accurately as taught or suggested by Putnam.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,625

Art Unit: 1772

The difference between the instant claim and Speer is that Speer fails to disclose an oxygen indicator which comprises all or part of a printed image.

Inoue discloses an oxygen indicator which comprises all or part of a printed .

image (column 3, line34 through column 4, line 19) in packaging for the purpose of providing decorative indication of the presence of oxygen in packaging.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to have provided an oxygen indicator which comprises all or part of a printed image in the package of Speer in order to provide decorative indication of the presence of oxygen in packaging as taught or suggested by Inoue.

In claims 2 and 4 applicant recites various layer configurations for the barrier, scavenger and indicator layers. A rearrangement of the essential working components of a product absent clear and convincing evidence of an unexpected result is obvious and well within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art (MPEP 2144) especially since Putnam suggests that the indicator can be an inner or outer layer and Speer discloses a variety of configurations for the layers in a container as discussed above. Therefore it would have been obvious to configure the layers as recited by applicant in order to prevent ingress of oxygen and to accurately detect the ingress of oxygen (applies to instant claims 2 and 4).

Putnam discloses wherein the oxygen barrier layers that substantially shield the oxygen indicator from oxygen in the environment surrounding the container, and from oxygen in any headspace within the container, are selected from the group consisting of discrete layers with a relatively low oxygen transmission rate, and adhesive or other

Application/Control Number: 10/719,625 Page 5

Art Unit: 1772

layers which allow limited ingress of oxygen, but at a rate that allows the indicator to be monitored for an indication of the presence or absence of oxygen dissolved in the solid material carrying the oxygen scavenger, without significant influence from atmospheric effects (column 11, line 17 through column 12, line12) (applies to instant claim 31).

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/06 have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant has argued that Putnam teaches away from a printed image. However, the disclosure (column 1, lines 54-65) is in reference to the prior art not Putnam's own invention. Although Putnam do not provide an image per se, there is no direct teaching away from providing an oxygen indicator as an image. Note that the act of printing is a method limitation which does not carry patentable weight (2113). The question of patentability is whether it is obvious to provide the oxygen indicator as an image.

Applicant has argued that Inoue discloses its oxygen indicator for use in head space scavenging of a gaseous medium inside a package. However, Inoue is not relied upon for any showing of head space oxygen indication. Inoue is relied upon to show that providing an oxygen indicator in the form of an image was well known and obvious at the time of applicant's invention for the purpose of providing an oxygen indicator in decorative, easily recognized form.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1772

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Miggins whose telephone number is 571-272-1494. The examiner can normally be reached on 1:00-10:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772

Michael C. Miggins

MCM January 22, 2007